

Remarks for Corrected Response A

This CORRECTED RESPONSE A is in reply to the Office Action mailed November 26, 2003. The Office Action indicated that the previous RESPONSE A which was in reply to the Office action mailed August 13, 2003, did not contain the proper formatting for amendments. In particular, amendments to correct typographical errors in the specification were submitted by line number when they should have been submitted as replacement paragraphs. This CORRECTED RESPONSE submits the amendments in the proper format. The Remarks were included in the Response A to the Office Action mailed August 13, 2003.

Remarks for Response A

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed August 13, 2003. No fee is due for the addition of any new claims.

Claims 1-14 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-14. The present Response amends claims 1, 2, and 9-11, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-14. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The disclosure was objected to because it was missing information and it contained grammar mistakes. The Applicant has corrected the noted missing information and mistakes and has proof read the entire application. Typographical errors are corrected in the amendment to the specification section above. Applicant respectfully submits that the patent application is in condition to overcome this objection and requests the objection be withdrawn.

RESPONSE TO REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §112

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 9 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, stating that there is insufficient antecedent basis for several limitations in these claims. In particular, Examiner states there is no antecedent basis for “data content” in line 13 of claim 1, “web page data portion” in line 7 of claim 1, “the link” in line 14 of claim 1, and “the identified telephone numbers” in lines 8 and 11 of claim 9. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2 and 9 to correct the antecedent basis of these limitations, and respectfully submits that claims 1, 2 and 9 now overcome this rejection.

Applicant has further amended claim 1 to remove the language “can be” and more clearly recite an embodiment of the invention.

RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

The Claimed Invention Distinguishes Over the Combination of AAPA and Horowitz

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 12-14 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of United States Patent No. 6,122,647 (Horowitz). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection based on the combination of AAPA and Horowitz.

Examiner states that AAPA discloses receiving a URL from a user and accessing a web page data file identified by the URL. Examiner further states that Horowitz discloses detecting a data portion from the web page data portion that can be enhanced by introducing a link to a service, identifying web content data which can be accessed to provide a link service from a mobile device through a wireless connection, and displaying the identified data content using the link indication on a display tool.

Horowitz discloses receiving a user input selecting a portion of a document, determining links to be the most common word or phrases in the selected portion, and creating a hyperlink to content associated with the link. Horowitz requires user selection of a considerable portion of a page of content before providing links regarding the content. Further, the links are provided within the selected content.

The invention as claimed in claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over AARA in view of Horowitz. Horowitz does not disclose a method intended for use with a mobile device. To the contrary, the system disclosed by Horowitz is intended and designed to be used with a larger desktop style computer (Figure 2, col. 5, lines 25-34). Additionally, Horowitz does not disclose detecting a data portion from the web page data file that can be enhanced by introducing a link indication to a service. The hyperlinks provided by Horowitz are associated with more content, not a service. Horowitz does not disclose identifying web content data which can be accessed to provide a link service from a mobile device. Contrary to the present invention, Horowitz discloses providing a page of content to a user, receiving user input selecting a portion of the page of input, and providing links within the selected portion that access further content (Figures 4a-4c, col. 7, lines 1-8). The content displayed for the user from which a portion must be selected is cumbersome to display on mobile device. Further, the generated links are provided within the selected portion of the content, along with the rest of the web page content. To select the links in context of the full page of content would be undesirably slow on a typical screen of a mobile device.

Claim 2-8 and 12-14 directly or indirectly depend on allowably claim 1. Thus, claims 2-8 and 12-14 are allowable as dependent on an allowable claim in addition to the distinguishing elements they recite.

The Claimed Invention of claims 9-11 Distinguishes Over the Combination of AAPA and the Prior Art

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of United States Patent No. 5,850,433 (Rondeau). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection based on the combination of AARA and Rondeau and AARA and NJIT.

With regard to claim 9, Rondeau discloses a system for searching for phone numbers from a database based on received user input, the input originating from a desktop style computer, providing the phone numbers to the user on a desktop style monitor, receiving input selecting a phone number from a keyboard, and calling the phone number. Rondeau does not disclose or relate to any processing of phone numbers from web

page content or processing and providing information over a mobile device. Thus, the combination of AARA and Rondeau do not disclose the invention as claimed in claim 9.

With regard to claim to claim 10 and 11, NJIT discloses a web site that displays an address and an email. NJIT does not disclose providing a map or sending an email upon selection of a user keypad of a mobile device as claimed in claims 10 and 11, respectfully. Thus, the combination of AARA and Rondeau do not disclose the invention as claimed in claims 10 and 11.

The references cited by the Examiner but not relied upon have been reviewed, but are not believed to render the claims unpatentable, either singly or in combination.

Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 12, 2003

By: _____
Stephen R. Bachmann
Reg. No. 50,806

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800